DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 292 FL 027 122

AUTHOR Alieva, Natalia F.
TITLE About Categories of Tense and Aspect in Indonesian/Malay.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; Form Classes (Languages); *Indonesian; *Indonesian Languages; *Malay; Morphology (Languages); Syntax; *Tenses (Grammar); Time Perspective; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This paper examines whether there is a grammatical category of tense in the Indonesian/Malay language (IML), suggesting that IML has a syntactical category of tense that serves to grammaticize time relations in a clause predicate which is not necessarily verbal. The discussion takes a systemic view of grammatical categories in an analytical language, noting that in cases when no synthetic morphological forms exist, only specific phenomena of syntactical paradigms can be considered as grammatical categories. The paper explains that the problem of tense in the IML must be analyzed in connection with aspectuality because such phenomena as verb reduplication and many ter-, ber-, and -i forms have an aspectual component in their meanings. In the IML, there are analytical markers that take part in expressing temporal and/or aspectual relations. The paper proposes principles and systemic views on their categorical nature, examining the grammatical semantics of the markers in question and of the proper complexes themselves and explaining that the outlined evolution in interpreting grammatical notations and categories allowed a search for new perception of the IML phenomena in the functional-semantical domain of tense and aspect. At the lexical level, verbs are classified into different aspectual meanings. At the syntactical level, there is a type of tense grammatical category. (Contains 26 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 292

Natalia F. Alieva (Moscow)

About categories of tense and aspect in Indonesian / Malay

Natalia F. Alieva

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 027122

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Natalia F. Alieva (Moscow)

About categories of tense and aspect in Indonesian / Malay

0.1. The first - nuclear - question in consideration of the named problem is obviously the following: Is there a grammatical category of tense in the Indonesian / Malay language (further - the IML)? My opinion is that in IML there is a syntactical category of tense that serves to grammaticalize time relations in a clause predicate which is not necessarily verbal. This category is considered here as opposed to the category of aspect, or actionsart, that is really verbal.

0.2. The principal approach to the discussion and solution of the present question is a systemic view upon grammatical categories in an analytical language. In cases when no synthetical morphological forms exist, only specific phenomena of syntactical paradigms can be considered as grammatical categories.

0.3. The problem of tense in the IML must be analysed, and it is often done, in connection with aspectuality, because at least such phenomena as verb reduplication and many *ter-, ber-, -i* forms have an aspectual component in their meanings. The usual way of evolution of tense category in various languages is also from and through the devices of expressing aspectual meanings which obtain as a verbal morphological category or as a derivative actionsart category .

At the same time the formation of a tense category includes modal semantics and forms because assertions of events can be naturally connected with some information of their location in time.

0.4. In the IML, besides the mentioned synthetical forms with aspect meanings, there are analytical markers that take part in expressing temporal and/or aspectual relations. These markers can be united in one category paradigm including three sets of units, each with its negative marker or markers. They are:

I. sudah, telah, pernah, baru.....negator *belum;*
II. sedang, masih, lagi.....negators *tidak, belum;*
III. akan, hendak ~nak, kelak, bakal (rare).....negators *tidak / tak /belum akan, takkan.*

They can be presented as *sudah*-set, *sedang*-set, *akan*-set.
Some examples on their use are given bellow in Appendix 1.
My aim here is not to describe in detail how these words are used, but just to propose some principles and systemic views on their categorial nature.

1.1. The shown above paradigm can be computed with two else similar paradigms of markers. One is the paradigm of *modality*, consisting of objective logical meanings: affirmative *ada*, negative *tidak / bukan / belum / janggan / kagak,* capability *dapat / boleh / bisa/ berhak/ sanggup,* necessity *harus / mesti / wajib / perlu,* intention *inggin / hendak / mau / berniat*. Another paradigm is that of *phases* (beginning, continuing, finishing) that also consist of grammatical markers standing in the left

027/22

position to lexical predicate words. I want to underline also some modal connotations of the temporal markers, as :

------- realisation or actuality in the meanings of *sudah, telah, pernah, sedang, akan;*

------- limited actuality for the definite time in *masih, lagi;*

------- possibility or necessity + temporal negation in *belum.*

These three paradigms - tense, modality, and phases - help to express various meanings of reference of the content of a clause to the world reality termed as *predicativeness.*

As analytical grammatical markers these words are characterized by:

- inability to be used (at least with the same meaning) as the nuclear word in a syntactic phrase;
- inability to express on their own, with the same meaning, the predicate of a clause;
- specific dependent syntactical position: on the left of the nuclear lexeme, producing with it a grammatical complex;
- attaching to such a complex definite grammatical meaning;
- being in paradigmatical connection and interchange with other help-words united in the same paradigm by similar grammatical category semantics;
- being optionally, not obligatorilly used.

As far as I know, the nature of the tense/aspect markers has never been linguistically thoroughly analyzed, at least in published works. The bibliography compiled by I.M. McCoy [1985] testifies to this fact as well. However, each grammar book has a definition of some kind. The meanings of the markers are generally described, and they are classified as particles, adverbs, auxiliary verbs, auxiliary words, aspect verbs.

Semantically each marker expresses one meaning of its grammatical category, and with such peculiar meaning it has a definite position in the whole paradigm. Some bounded non-lexical auxiliary words must be seen as the main elements of the paradigm that determine its abstract grammatical character. Among the temporal markers, as such can be considered: *telah, masih, belum, akan, kelak, bakal.* Some content words for a long time being used as de-lexicalized units are included in the temporal paradigm with definite grammatical meanings; thus, *sudah, baru, sedang, hendak/nak,* possibly *pernah* do have lexical meanings and can be used in a clause as free words, as in: *kejadian yang sudah; sangat hendak makan ;Topi ini baru; Kemahirannya sedang.*

In the position of grammatical marker which is mostly usual for such words, they only preserve some abstract components of their semantics. For instance, they cannot be substituted by their lexical synonyms without serious change in content meaning (compare: *sudah belajar* // *tamat belajar, akan dipukul* // *mau dipukul.*

1.2. As it was mentioned, the grammatical markers are put in front of various predicate words, and a binary syntactical unit is formed, serving grammatical needs. I call such model *grammatical complex.* The nucleus of the complex is a variable constituent, it can be any lexeme of the class or subclass that fulfil definite function, in our case the function of predicate with location in time. On the contrary, the grammatical marker is a relatively standard unit belonging to a definite paradigm;

with a change of grammatical meaning it can be substituted by an element of the same paradigm. In definite contexts it can be omitted. Complexes with such markers exist as a paradigmatical row that has some functional similarities with conjugation paradigms of synthetical languages (the 1-st example in the Appendix 1). The important feature of difference is that they are used optionally, not obligatory. From this we naturally can come to the decision of the problem of grammatical categories in analytical languages, of course, with many peculiarities - some of them are evident from the features of grammatical markers given above (1.1.).Hereby we should have in mind that a grammatical category join in itself a definite variable categorial meaning with definite formal devices. The last ones can be:

1) Synthetical morphological forms of a word (ex.: in Russian - the tense paradigm of perfect-aspectual verbal forms, with person and number: _INFINITIVE: *dat '* 'to give', PRESENT: *daju / dajosh / dajot / dajut ,*
PAST: *dal / dala / dalo / dali* , FUTURE: *dam / dash / dast/ dadim / dadite / dadut* .

2) Mixed paradigms including synthetical forms and obligatory analytical complexes (ex.: the indefinite tense paradigm in English: *went, go/goes, shall/will go*; in the IML - the voice paradigm of the three obligatory affixed forms of transitive verbs: *membawa, dibawa,* PRON + *O-bawa*).

3) Paradigms of analytical complexes including auxiliary and help-words used optionally as grammatical markers in definite position to the nuclear lexeme.

The third sort of these three is proper for analytical languages and some languages with high degree of analytism, as the IML is .

1.3. As a syntactical model of a binary unit without predicative relation inside, *a grammatical complex* must be distinguished from two other models of this kind in the IML system.

Firstly, from *a binary verbal phrase* consisting also of two components: a head verb and a dependent word. The last is a full lexeme and its place is on the right, after the head: *lari cepat, berbicara pelahan, datang terlambat.* I specially choose the words giving temporal characteristics. They also may have their servants and form phrases.

The other syntactical model that can consist of two members is *a serial predicate*, a paratactic polypredicative structure, as in: *Anak itu terburu-buru lari dari anjing.* Both verbs *terburu-buru* and *lari* are free lexemes, each can be a predicate itself, can form a complex or a phrase.

1.4. The temporal grammatical markers in complexes should be distinguished also from *adverbs of time*. It needs attention because in several grammars of former times (I mention them bellow: 3.3.) the grammatical markers were called adverbs, together with *kemarin, dulu, sekarang, kini, besok, lusa, nanti.* Adverbs in the IML can take the left position to predicate, in the same way as grammatical markers: *Ayah sekarang / dulu / besok* (adverbs) *// sedang / telah / akan* (markers) *ada di Jakarta.* But the adverbs always can be moved, and sometimes even must be, to the beginning or to the end of the clause. They can interchange with temporal phrases *(hari ini, minggu yang*

lalu, minggu depan), or even with subordinate clause or verbal group - nothing of these is possible for grammatical markers.
Such rarely used words as *kelak, bakal* can function sometimes as adverbs, but with non-verbal predicate they are used instead of *akan* as proper temporal markers: *Ayah kelak ke desa.* *(See Note II).*
Baru may have two meanings - of a temporal marker of a moment in close past ('just'), and of an adverb 'only', ex. *Sebuah mangga baru dibawanya.* 'He has just brought one mango fruit'; *Dibawanya baru sebuah.* 'He brought only one fruit.

2.1. Now we may proceed to the grammatical semantics of the markers in question and of the proper complexes themselves.

And really, the question is still demanding solution: those three sets of the first paradigm (*sudah*-set, *sedang*-set, *akan*-set) are of what kind, do they serve to express category meanings of tense or aspect ?

After more than 40 years of studying the IML and literature about it, in connection with the investigation of tense and aspect grammatical categories in general linguistics and in my own Russian language, I can see two main approaches to considering the problem of the grammatical categories of tense and aspect in IML. The both are presupposing that some obligatory morphological expression is not a necessary property.

The first approach proceeds from the traditional and wide-spread view to tense as a category of primarily deictic (or connector, or auto-referential) character which serve to indicate "absolute" time relations, i.e. relations to the point of speech and speech situation. The IML markers under consideration are not restricted in their use by this circumstance. Naturally the conclusion may follow that they express *aspects;* especially the meaning of often used *sudah* 'finished, achieved' suggests such interpretation.

The second approach is based on the view upon the tense category that is different from the traditional one included in the first approach. The concept of the *grammaticalization of location of events in time* as another definition of tense [Comrie 1985: 25]) is far more wide. An event can be related to any point on the time line, and the meanings of tense in a language can be characterized as primarily relative , while the deictic ("absolute") reference will be considered just as a secondary possibility. The IML grammatical markers therefore may be defined as markers of *relative temporal* reference, and not as aspectual. The 2nd and 3rd groups of examples in Appendix 1 illustrate just such non-deictic temporal relations.
The point or period of time can be hereby indicated either lexically in the clause or by any means in the sentence and/or in the paragraph of discourse. And this is a very important quality of text in IML (and other analytical languages), for without it no expression of time reference is possible.

2.2. The second approach should be preferred, to my mind, because it permits to get rid of some contradictory moments which we have to ignore in case we adopt the first, deictic consideration. With the deictic approach, there are some facts that should not be accepted, as:

(a) the words of the set III - *akan*-set - express posteriority, or future, therefore in no way they can be interpreted in terms of aspects; however they enter the same paradigm with other markers;

(b) the category of aspect is by definition a verbal category that presuppose the verbal expression of states and actions. But most of the IML markers in view can be freely used in non-verbal predicates expressed differently: by nouns, adjectives, prepositional NP's, and even quantifiers and numerals (several examples are given in Appendix 1: 4, 7, 8, 9, 12 - and in Appendix 2); the exclusions are *telah, akan* and in some cases *sedang* that usually combine with verbs;

(c) such ordinary complexes as: *sudah belajar, telah beristeri, sedang terjadi* should be acknowledged as inherently contradictory: *belajar, beristeri* have continious mening, *sudah, telah* are perfect, *terjadi* means 'already happened', *sedang* have continious meaning;

(d) aspects themselves have no negative variants, while *sudah, telah, baru* can be changed for *belum; sedang, masih* can be changed for *tidak (lagi).*

(e) many of the markers of this interesting paradigm, with prefix *se-* or without it , can serve as conjunctions with clear temporal meanings by subordinate clauses or verbal phrases, and this function is far from aspectuality.

Considering the markers as temporal we apply the systemic method and avoid these contradictions, because, unlike an aspectual marker that must be connected to a verb, a temporal marker belongs to the clause predicate. The predicate in the IML actually

(a) can express future event;

(b) is not obligatorily verbal and can exist without a verb or a link-verb, being presented by nouns, adjectives, prepositional NP's, quantifiers (see Appendix 3).

(c) allows to combine various temporal meaning of markers with a definite aspectual meaning of the head verb, ex.: *sudah belajar* 'to be (already) in the durative state of learning up to the point of time'; *sedang terjadi di dunia* 'to be repeatedly occurring in the world at the period of time';

(d) can normally contain negation;

(e) can have temporal relation with the predicate of another clause in the same sentence .

By excluding analytical complexes from the aspectual subsystem, we get one more positive result from the systemic point of view: the category of aspect in the IML looks more homogeneous as expressed by synthetic means only, including the meanings of lexemes.

The proposed resolution looks systemic and logical, but from the practical use of terms some hezitations exist, that I am discussing bellow.

Thus we have two principal approaches to the consideration of the interrelation of the categories of tense and aspect in the IML. The second approach could be formulated and theoretically motivated only at a certain period of time, as soon as the linguistic views upon the tense category developed during the last decades. Such evolution has not been completely acknowledged by all the linguists up to now, by the way (see bellow: 3.4. and 3.5).

3.1. Perhaps it would be interesting to make a short survey of that development.

Historically during my long evolution I have tried to apply both of this views. And now the second, so to say "tense", approach is considered by me as more satisfying from the point of view of systemic linguistic investigation.
Bellow I am setting forth with more details and arguments my considerations that were launched and proposed in some published works [Alieva et al.1991:145-152,196-198, 370-388; Alieva 1993; 1998]. #

3.2. Before that I feel it desirable to touch upon one question that may naturally arise in minds of our colleagues for whom the IML is a mother-tongue. Why and what for shall we dig up in their language some categories, not visible on surface for themselves? Is it not a kind of theoretical imposition? I also put this question to myself, naturally.

First of all, why am I interested in these peculiar categories? My publications show by the way that I am interested in the grammar of the IML as a whole, and precisely as a whole system.

Secondly, I must state that I am really searching and digging in the original literary texts by Indonesian and Malaysian writers, taking and analysing examples from high quality texts, never from the translations from European languages. I have thousands of examples written on cards.

When I read texts in Indonesian and Malay, I interprete them in my mind in Russian, the more so if I make written or oral translation, which I have made much. And in Russian (as in English) it is almost impossible to have a clause without a finite verb in obligatory tense and aspect forms. There are no such forms in the IML texts, but necessary information in other forms can be usually found permitting me to choose Russian verbal forms, and I am confident about my perception and choice. If not, my communication with other people in that language would not be possible, would it?

Such processes are usual and necessary in international communication. The plain pragmatic computing or the typological linguistic comparison provides basis for correct discourse perception and creation.
And this is one of explanations why in the history of civilisation it often occurred that the description of a definite language, sometimes belonging to a prominent nation (Persian, Sanskrit) was made primarily by a representative of another language.

3.3. Now I return to the problem of tense and aspect, and possible approaches to it. When I was beginning to study grammars and textbooks on the IML - by S.T. Alisjahbana, C.A.Mees, M.G.Emeis, A.A.Fokker, Madong Lubis, Armijn Pane and some others - the words enumerated by me now as markers of tense were considered as adverbs of time - just of time - together with such words as *dahulu, kemarin, sekarang, kini, besok, nanti, tatkala ini/itu* etc. The problem of aspectuality was but a bit touched by A.Fokker (who knew Russian) [1951] and C. Mees [1955].
To me as a Russian linguist tense and aspect categories were natural, but the concept of tense known to me was quite Russian and European, wherein present, past and future meanings were "absolute" and referred to the moment of speech, being obligatorily expressed by morphological devices. You cannot find such category in the IML.

At the same time it was evident that the IML words in question were not free lexemes as adverbs are, but sooner some kind of analytical grammatical markers as mentioned above (1.4.). In many cases their use is really connected with characterization of the ways the processes go in, or with aspectuality. Therefore in the first description of Indonesian in Russian made by me with A.Teselkin [Teselkin, Alieva 1960], I briefly wrote about these words as aspectual markers. In many descriptions of the following time I found similar approaches, and was satisfied, ignoring hereby existing contradictions.

It could not last for long time, and hesitations arose because no aspectual approach could explain such combinations as *sudah belajar sekarang, kini telah berderajat tinggi, pada minggu yang lalu sudah akan berangkat, takkan setuju* as well as the use of markers in non-verbal predicates: *Ia sedang / sudah / belum / akan ke kota*, etc. Especially it is important in relation to the future markers. In fact, many new investigations were done and excellent descriptions of Indonesian and Malaysian had appeared, but these problems did not attract the attention they deserved.

In our more detailed Indonesian grammar, written in 60-ties and published in 1972 [Alieva et. al. 1972], I also did not give any detailed discussion of the tense-aspect problem. But a bit wider view was proposed: I wrote there about *vido-vremennyje znachenija = aspectual-temporal* meanings. I was not satisfied with the common views, but I was waiting and hoping for the considerations based on the inherent language feelings of colleagues in Indonesia and Malaysia. However they up to now are apt to the "aspectual" approach: this is evident from the survey of views by Moh. Tadjuddin [1993: 155-159]. Bambang Kaswanti Purwo gives an ingenious analysis of 'pemarkah waktu' - temporal markers *sudah, telah, masih, baru* in the context of deixis in general, not specially of tense. [Kaswanti 1984: 228-237]. And even Asmah Haji Omar in her latest book termed the markers as 'aspect verbs' giving mixed aspectual-temporal scheme of their semantics [Asmah 2000: 36].

3.4. In 1957 pioneering ideas about shifter (deictic) and connector (relative) grammatical categories were proposed by Roman Jacobson [Jacobson 1957]. It cannot be denied that in the general theoretical linguistics based mainly upon the Indo-European languages these ideas have not attracted due attention. Th. Pettersson, the Swedish linguist, has published in 1994 an article generalizing the existing approaches in considering tense. He shows that the leading Western linguists adhere up to now to Aristotle's concept of tense as a morphological category of verb based semantically upon the relation in time to the speech point [Pettersson 1994]. Neither Jespersen [1924], nor Reichenbach [1947], whose works are generally considered to be most important in this sphere proposed cardinal innovations. Nor did E. Benveniste, in spite of his widest knowledge of facts of various language families.

In the wide-known comparatively new book by B.Comrie "Tense" [1986] some concession is made to the view that in definite languages relative temporal meanings may be primary towards the secondary "absolute" (deictic) ones in the functioning of tense categories, but the author himself concentrates actually upon "absolute" meanings, considering hereby obligatory expression and morphological binding as the most important parameters for a grammatical category [Comrie 1986: 10]. This presumption can only lead to the conclusion that analytical languages, and the IML

among them, can have no grammatical categories, including tense. This takes us far back in time, to the views of the universalists.

3.5. Meanwhile in the 70-80-ties the Russian scholars were conducting creative searches, and the concepts of grammatical categories, including tense, aspect, phases, mood, voice, developed considerably. By our leading specialist V. Bondarko who did not ignore R. Jacobson's ideas, a concept was clearly formulated regarding two possible semantic structures of categories of tense in different languages, one with the priority of *deictic* reference and the second with the priority of *relative* reference [Bondarko 1971: 112].

Such theoretical conclusions were a good basis in our oriental linguistics for new and to my mind more adequate considerations about grammatical categories of analytical languages : V. Kasevich regarding Burmese, Ye. Rachkov regarding Tagalog, Nguyen Tay Can and I. Bystrov regarding Vietnamese, N. Syrom'atnikov regarding Japanese. These and other Russian specialists, including the present author, have the conviction that in analytical languages definite syntactical structures that consist of a lexical unit with an optionally used help-word denote variants of one grammatical meaning and can be united in a paradigm. And such a paradigm serves as a device for expressing grammatical category, though deprived of obligatory morphological forms (in direct contradiction to the preferred by B.Comrie definition). With this we acknowledge that analytical languages also have a grammatical system, a system of special kind.

3.6. When investigating Austronesian languages, we are first of all searching for grammatical meanings in morphological, synthetical forms: affixed and duplicated forms, and this is natural and correct. But even in synthetical forms in the IML there is no difference between finite and non-finite verbal forms. In studying some languages that have no rich morphology, as the IML is, our approach should be widened with studying analytical devices.

Here the comparison with the structures of completely analytical languages, such as Chinese, Thai, Viet-Muong, Mon-Khmer, Cham, can be very useful. Working as a member of the section of the Chinese and Southeast Asian languages and taking part in the field-work of the national minorities linguistic expedition in Vietnam, I have got acquainted with many interesting compatible data. (Some part of them are reflected in my paper presented at the international Pan-Asiatic Symposium on Languages and Linguistics in Ho Chi Minh City [Alieva 2000]). Please see also Note I.

4.1. The outlined principal evolution in interpreting grammatical notions and categories permitted me also to search for new perception of the IML phenomena in the functional-semantical domain of tense and aspect. At the lexical level, we may speak of classification of verbs (simple, affixed, duplicated) into classes with different aspectual meanings. At the syntactical level a kind of tense grammatical category may be spoken of.

4.2. Generally in aspectual-temporal field in the IML we have some synthetical forms.
In this context special attention must be given first of all to such a peculiar morphological device as *reduplication*. It is rather regularly combining in verbs,

affixed or simple, with their inherent aspectual meanings, adding or amplifying various meanings of intensity, iteration and involvement of many actants. (These processes are shown in detail by Moh. Tadjuddin [1993] and Agus Salim [1997]). Reduplication in the IML is very close to the concept of grammatical category of intensive aspect.. But there is a complication however because duplicated verbal forms can contain some opposite to intensity meanings of weakness or weak similarity. From the other side, dialectal, or idiolectal peculiarities of style and taste very strongly influence the use of reduplication.

There are some sets of prefixed verbs with dominating aspectual meanings: many *ter-* verbs express perfectiveness, many *ber-* verbs have durative meanings. However this is not obligatory, as both models can render meanings other than these; *ter-:* passive, accidental, involuntary (*terbawa, terperanjat), ber-:* punctual (*berangkat*) or neutral (*berkata, berdiri).*

4.3. Therefore as regards the IML we can speak only approximately about either a morphological verbal category of aspect or about regular derivative models of actionsart . These phenomena have not yet developed into a regular formal category. And still I consider it possible and pragmatically convenient to acknowledge that a part of the IML verbs can be characterised as having aspectual meanings, inherently included into their lexical semantics. This is relevant for some simple and derivative verbs, and naturally for duplicated forms.

4.3.1. Following first of all Armijn Pane [1950], I consider the verbs in the IML to be divided into three classes by their aspect meanings:

- with completive meaning (by A.Pane named 'momentaan');
- with durative meaning;
- with neutral, or double meaning.

The aspectual meanings in the IML can be united into two semantical fields; the first field correlates with completive verbs, and the second field correlates with durative verbs.

The meanings of the first, *completive field* characterize a process/state/action/movement, etc. as: complete, perfect, finished, resultative, momental, single, frequentative, accidental, involuntary; the action or state hereby is denoted as a whole notion, different from other actions and states. It is not divided into stages, or phases, and a verb with completive meaning cannot have markers of phases (mula/mulai 'beginning', tengah 'middle', habis / tamat / selesai 'end'). The attention in the sentence is directed to participants, results, localization.

The meanings of the second, *durative field,* characterise a process as: continuing, developing, long, imperfect, not-finished, intensive, repeated, directed to several actants (agents or patients). The attention is directed to the phases, time frame, the accompanying processes and circumstances.

Although the verbs which obviously have completive and durative meanings do not constitute the majority of the IML verbs, they are frequently used and influencing the whole temporal-aspectual domain of the language system. .

4.3.2. I expressed this assumption in our Indonesian grammar (in Indonesian) [Alieva et al. 1991: 145-152] and further in my monograph in Russian [Alieva 1998: 129-169]. A difficult question was to find diagnostic formula. My semantical and statistical analysis of texts shows that such temporal markers as *baru* in the meaning 'just' (proximate priority), and *masih* (simultaneity) in the clearest way indicate the difference between completive and durative meanings of verbs: the first normally joins completive and does not join durative verbs, the second joins durative, not completive verbs, and both can join neutral verbs. It must be added that the distributive capacities of transitive and intransitive verbs are not quite the same.

A table as an illustration for the distribution of intransitive verbs was given in the book of 1991 (Alieva et al., 1991: 148-149). I apply it here as Appendix 3.

4.3.3. In order to reach a comprehensive knowledge of the aspectual meaning of each verb, many syntactical and semantical factors must be studied. Herein complications often are caused by the semantics of verbs, as their meanings can include nuances of beginning, continuing, finishing of the named actions or states. Of course, the aspectual meanings of verbs are closely connected with the temporal characteristics of a verb in discourse.
The most valuable investigation is presented in the monograph on aspectuality in Indonesian by M.Tadjuddin [1993]. It is influenced however by his method of comparing Indonesian verbs with Russian for the translation purposes. The investigations by Agus Salim [1990, 1997] also must be taken into consideration.

4.4. Now some words again about temporal grammatical complexes in connection to the problem of aspectuality. Their special syntactical function is that of a clause predicate. The main components of complexes express various properties of subjects: active action towards an object , or being the goal of such an action, or intensive movement, up to equating the subject to a dead natural thing, with intermediate active or inactive processes or states. Naturally most often temporal markers are combined with verbs that express dynamic properties existing in time. Some markers - *telah, akan, sedang, baru* - are rather restricted in their distribution, their usual position is with the verbs of such semantics. But an important feature is that the predicate in the IML may be expressed *normally* not by verbs only (as in European languages) , but as well by nouns, pronouns, adjectives, various nominal phrases, and even numerals. Most rarely pronouns are joined with temporal markers, while words of other classes that indicate states or changes in time or space may have such distribution. A few examples of such non-verbal predicates with temporal markers are given in Appendix 2.

To my mind, in such cases no aspectual phenomena may be spoken of - if the terms are used strictly. Only reference to time point or period is shown which in turn may be indicated in relation to the point of speech. I repeat that such indications of temporal relations are most necessary in IML texts. They may be maid by lexical means or by discourse surrounding.

Should we insist on terminology, or should not? Anyhow to understand and interprete scientifically the essense of the grammatical phenomena is always useful, is not it?

4.5. I think, this could be an answer to the opinion proclaimed by Prof. Anton Moeliono at the linguistic symposium in 1966, when the question of the direction of the IML development was really keen. He said that time: "Kita tidak boleh bersikap lagi sebagai penulis dahulu, baik penulis Belanda maupun Indonesia, yang hendak mencari sesuatu yang tidak ada". [Simposium, 1966: B 4]. Among such unacceptional notions he mentioned the predicate which according to traditional linguistics must be expressed by a finite form of a verb or a link-verb. I don't think however that the absence of finite verb forms , as well as nominal cases, in the IML must inspire us to throw away the logical deep and surface notions of predicate, subject, objects, grammatical categories, and others.

As to the use of the terms 'tense' and 'aspect', there is a pragmatic argument against it deserving attention: the most of grammarians in Indonesia and Malaysia are used and apt to call these markers as aspectual (in speech: 'aspek-aspek'). Perhaps they consider such a category more identical and inherent, while tense with its "damned" morphological forms is not their own, native property? By the way, the Anglo-Germanic phenomenon of the tense category wherein temporal and aspectual meanings are mixed, can be considered rather proximate to the IML grammatical semantics in this field (more than to the Russian, for instance). Therefore the problem of terms is not at all simple. Perhaps some drift in terminology is acceptable. I mean the use of 'aspect' instead of 'tense' regarding grammatical complexes. And then, how shall we refer to the real aspect meanings of verbs, inherent or expressed by reduplication and affixes? Such meanings may be united - rather reasonably, I must say, - under the term of *'actionsart'*, or *'aspectuality'*. Just such is M.Tadjuddin's approach [1993].
In Austronesian linguistics some drift in terminology actually happens. For instance, the ergative language structure which has been a property of languages with formal nominal cases, is described in languages without such cases (Oceanic). Also the term 'case' itself is used in the analysis of verbal forms (Philippine). Why really cannot we accept in the IML grammars the term 'aspect' for the tense syntactical category? Only it must be named *'temporal aspect'* (preferring strict attitude to terminology, I don't like it, but what does it mean?).

However I don't rule out, especially under the impression of the latest book by Prof. Asmah Haji Omar [2000], that all these complicated considerations are not at all necessary and that the Indonesian and Malaysian linguistics will develop in some other direction, quite different and original.

5. Conclusion.

These are my thoughts on the issue of tense and aspect as interrelated categories in the IML. They are the syntactical category of tense and lexico-grammatical category of aspect. I underline again that the tense category in the IML is syntactical by its semantics and devices. Semantically it is a part of predicativeness, together with modality. By these categories a clause is distinguished from a group of words. As the devices of their expression, specific analytical syntactical units are used which I describe as *grammatical complexes*.

I would like to hope that my considerations can be useful for developing the knowledge about the inner structure of this beautiful and so well organized language,

and such knowledge can help to formulate rules and to further enrich the language as a system. Because its wide and various modern functionsin Nusantara big countries will demand an appropriate level of comprehension and a more perfect and advanced grammatical description.

Notes.

Note I. I cannot help mentioning a riddle of the material and semantic proximity of temporal markers in the IML and Vietnamese: *sudah ~ da, sedang ~ dang, se* (Viet) means posteriority / future - compare the IML *se-* in *setelah, sesudah, sebelum,* the modal particle *lah* resembles Viet
la, a link. If there was only one coincidence we would not pay attention to it, but such a set is exciting for fancy, is not it? At the same time such a Malayic language in Vietnam as Cham among these units has only *se* , and this fact testifies all the same for coincidence...

Note II. It is not excluded that *telah* and *kelak* are ethymologically tied: *te-lah* 'in past', *ke-lak* 'to future'.

Appendices.

Appendix 1.

The point of time reference isdeictic = the moment of speech :
(1) Bunyi-bunyi ini [...] dapat melambangkan bukan sahaja buah fikiran yang *sudah* dan *sedang* dilahirkan, tetapi juga yang *akan* dilahirkan. [Asmah 1986: 45].
(2) Ia *akan* ceritakan itu di mana-mana: *belum* menjadi bupati *telah* mendapat kehormatan setinggi itu! [Pram. A. Toer, Jejak langkah. 1985: 110].
(3) Sebenarnya Nek Ramlah *dah (=sudah)* meninggal kelmarin. [Nenek 7: Shahabudin Jurimi, Bila nenek menangis. // "Pita"1990,5].
(4) *Akan* sepikah kau tak berteman melayan perasaanmu? [Nenek 28].
(5) "Bulan depan saya *akan* pulang", tulis Adi dalam suratnya itu.[TBBBI 1988: 329].
The point of time reference is in the past from the deictic point of view:
(6) Tapi bulan Mei tahun itu Jerman *telah* menduduki negeri Belanda. [S. Situmorang, Djalan Mutiara. S.a.: 15].
(7) Anaknya *sudah* empat. [M.lubis, Harimau-harimau. 1975: 9].
(8) Pak Haji selalu membanggakan diri bahwa dia tak *pernah* sakit seumur hidupnya. [Lubis, ibid.: 24].
(9) Nenek *pernah* membilangi aku bahwa dulu disana *masih* hutan. [Ajip Rossidhi, Di tengah keluarga. 1961: 41].
10) Suatu sore ayah datang di rumah kami - rumah ibu - aku *sedang* membaca buku dan ibu *sedang* menjahit. [Ajip, ibid.: 13].
(11) Tangannya *masih* menggenggam keratan baju yang hampir siap dijahit. [Nenek 2].
(12) Semasa dia *masih* kanak-kanak, keluarganya tinggal di Kedah. [Asmah 2000: 42].

(13) Ramlah dan Jenab *masih lagi* terduduk lemah menyusuri kegelapannya. [Nenek 25].
(14) Tahun kemudiannya aku *akan* turut ujian masuk sekolah lanjutan. [Ajip, ibid.: 13].

The point of time reference is in the future from the deictic point of view:

(15) Hari berikutnya lagi Amir *sudah akan* terbang kembali ke Jakarta. [M.Diponegoro, Siklus. 1975: 146].
(16) Nanti di Pasuruan ia boleh memberi bukti bahwa ia *telah* berkata sebenarnya. [A.Moeis, Salah asuhan. 1956: 188].
(17) Bulan depan kami *masih akan* tinggal di Salatiga. [Percakapan].
(18) Bila bala bantuan datang besok, mungkin kami *akan* datang menyerbu kemari pula. [M.Dimyati, Manusia dan peristiwa. 1951 :67].
(19) Biar Jenab merasai saat-saat kepuasan dalam hidupnya nanti. Agar tidak terkilan menghadapi hari kematiannya *akan* datang. [Nenek 23].

Appendix 2.

Bapakku +	*sudah / baru / masih/ belum*	+ dosen.
	sudah / belum / belum lagi	+ tua.
	sudah / belum / masih belum /akan	+ sembuh.
	masih / lagi	+ muda / kuat
	masih, lagi, akan	+ sehat.
	sudah / sedang / masih	+ di kota.
	sudah / baru / pernah /belum / akan	+ ke kota.
	sudah / baru / masih belum	+ dari kota.
	sudah / sedang / masih / akan	+ seperti orang muda.
Modalnya +	*sudah / masih / belum / akan*	+ sejuta / sedikit.

Appendix 3.

Table: The distribution of *masih* and *baru* as diagnostical markers with the groups of intransitive verbs in IML

Verbs	*masih*	*baru*
I. Root verbs		
1. masuk I (+rumah)	-	+
2. masuk II (+partai)	+	+
3. timbul	-	+
4. runtuh	-	+
5. duduk	+	+
6. pergi	+	+
7. nampak	+	+
8. terbit (+matahari)	-	+
9. jatuh	-	+
10. tenggelam	+	+
11. kawin	(+)	+
12. ingat	+	+

13. tinggal		+		+
14. lari	+		+	
15. tidur		+		+
16. hormat		+		(-)
17. lahir		-		+
18. marah		+		+
19. benci		+		-
20. rindu		+		-

II. Verbs with prefix *ber-*

21. berhenti	+		+	
22. bekerja		+		(+)
23. belajar		+		(+)
24. berdarah	+		-	
25. berdagang	+		(+)	
26. beribu		+		-
27. berkata		+		+
28. bermimpi	+		+	
29. bersumpah	+		+	
30. bertunangan		+		+
31. berteriak	+		+	
32. berdiri		+		+
33. berkuda		+		(+)
34. bertelur		+		+

III. Verbs with prefix *me-*

35. menjadi		+/-		+
36. menyeru	+/-		+	
37. menari		+		+
38. memandang		+		+
39. memihak	+		+	
40. membatu	+		+	
41. menguning	+		+	
42. membeku	+		+	
43. menangis	+		+	
44. menyeringai		+		+
45. mendarat	+/-		+	

IV. Verbs with prefix *ter-*

46. terduduk	+/-		+	
47. terjatuh		-		+
48. terbaring	+		+	
49. terpadam	-		+	
50. terbayang	+		+	
51. terdiri		+		+

10

52. terbatuk	+/-		+	
53. terpaku		+		+
54. tertulang	+		+	
55. tertawa		+		+
56. tertunduk	+		+	
57. terlanggar	+/-		+	
58. terlangsung		+/-		+
59. tersebab	-		+	
60. terwujud	-		+	

References

Agus Salim1990. *Aspektual'nyje tipy glagolov i grammaticheskaja semantika reduplicirovannyh form v indonezijskom jazyke.* (Aspectual types of verbs and the grammatical meanings of duplicated forms in Indonesian. In Russian). // Sopr'azhonnost' glagol'nyh kategorij: 4-13. Kalinin univ.

------- **1997** *The problem of the aspectual classification of Indonesian verbs.* // Proceedings of the 7-th InternationalConference on Austronesian Linguistics: 217-232. Rodopi B.V. Amsterdam-Atlanta.

Alieva, N. 1993. *Problems of tense in general linguistics and the temporal system in Malay/Indonesian.* // Language and the Perception of Time and Space. Proceedings of the International Conference. Univ. of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur. Pp. 174-182.

-------**1998** *Typologicheskije aspecty Indonezijskoj grammatiki.* (The typological aspects of Indonesian grammar. Analytism and synthetism. Possessivity. In Russian). Moscow. 328p.

------- **2000** *Typological comparison of the Southeast Asian insular and peninsular languages: Grammatical structures* (with Vietnamese translation). // The Fifth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics. Proceedings - vol. 1: 3-58 National Univ. Hochiminh City.

Alieva et al.1972. N.Alieva, V. Arakin, A. Ogloblin, Yu. Sirk. *Grammatika indonezijskogo jazyka. (A grammar of Indonesian. In Russian).* Nauka, Moscow. 462 p.

Alieva et al. 1991. N.F.Alieva, V.D.Arakin, A.K.Ogloblin, Yu.H. Sirk. *Bahasa Indonesia. Deskripsi dan teori.* Seri ILDEP. Kanisius, Yogyakarta. 533 h.

Asmah Haji Omar 1986. *Bahasa dan alam pemikiran Melayu.* DBP. Kuala Lumpur.

-------- **2000.** *Malay perception of time.* Univ. Malaya. Kuala Lumpur. 104 p.

Bondarko 1971. ÄÓÏ‰‡ ÍÓ Ä.Ç. *Vid i vrem'a russkogo glagola.* (Aspect and tense of the Russian verb. In Russian). Prosveschenije. 240 p.

Comrie, B. 1978. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

-------- **1985. Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge Univ. Press.**

-------- **1986**. Tense. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Fokker, A.A. 1951. *Inleiding tot de studie van de Indonesische syntaxis.* Groningen-Djakarta. 242 bl.

Jacobson, R. 1957. *Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb.* (Russian Language Project). Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard Univ.

Jespersen, Otto 1924 /1965. The philosophy of language. W.W.Norton. New York.

Mees, C.A. 1955. *Tatabahasa Indonesia.* Cet. 5. Djakarta-Groningen. 328 h.

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang 1984. *Deiksis dalam bahasa Indonesia.* Seri ILDEP. Jakarta. 304 p.

Pane, Armijn 1950. *Mentjari sendi baru tata bahasa Indonesia.* Djakarta. 456 h.

Pettersson, Thore 1994. *Tense.* // Working papers, 42: 179-196. Lund univ., Dept. of Linguistics.

Reichenbach, Hans 1947. Elements of symbolic logic. New York.

Simposium 1966. *Simposium Bahasa dan Kesusastraan Indonesia.* Lembaga bahasa dan kesusastraan. Djakarta.

Sumardi, M. 1981. *Time relationship in Bahasa Indonesia.* // Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics . ANU (PL, C-77). Canberra.

Tadjuddin, Moh. 1993. *Pengungkapan Makna Aspektualitas bahasa Rusia dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Suatu Telaah tentang Aspek dan Aksionalitas.* Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa. 273 p.

Teselkin,A.., Alieva N. 1960. Indonezijskij jazyk *(The Indonesian language. In Russian).* Nauka, Moscow. 61p.

The author's sign Alieva (АЛИЕВА Н.Ф.)

Alieva, Natalia F.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE